



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,931	10/13/2004	Sudipto R. Chowdhuri	SYB/0114.00	5930
31779	7590	07/02/2007		
JOHN A. SMART 708 BLOSSOM HILL RD., #201 LOS GATOS, CA 95032-3503			EXAMINER MORRISON, JAY A	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,931	CHOWDHURI, SUDIPTO R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jay A. Morrison. (3) _____

(2) John Smart (Reg No. 34,929). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 48.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Copy/paste error was noted by applicant and Examiner has attached corrected pages 3 and 8 to Final Rejection mailed 4/6/07.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

adjusting the portions of the query to be executed in parallel based on memory resources available for executing the query; (generate parallel plan based on resources available, page 129, Section V, last paragraph; page 130, Section IV, last paragraph)

generating a schedule for execution of each operator tree; (ordering included in plan, page 128, second column, first paragraph)

returning a result indicating the operator tree having lowest execution cost based on its schedule for executing the query with available resources. (choose-plan, page 129, second column, second paragraph)

As per claim 49, Graefe teaches
the query comprises a Structured Query Language (SQL) expression. (page 122, first column, second paragraph)

As per claim 50, Graefe teaches
said creating step includes creating an operator tree including parallel operators for execution of portions of the query in parallel. (page 130, first column, second paragraph)

As per claim 51, Graefe teaches
said parallel operators comprise iterators for applying predefined behavior to data. (page 125, first column, second paragraph)

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graefe ('Volcano – An Extensible and Parallel Query Evaluation System', IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, Vol 6 No 1, February 1994) in view of Graefe et al. ('Dynamic Query Evaluation Plans", Oregon Graduate Center, 1989, ACM).

As per claim 1, Graefe teaches

In a database system, a method for parallel optimization of a query, the method comprising: (see abstract)

generating a plurality of parallel plans for obtaining data requested by the query, the parallel plans including parallel operators for executing portions of the query in parallel; (query plans, page 124, first column, first paragraph)

creating a schedule for each parallel plan indicating a sequence for execution of operators of each parallel plan; (ordering included in plan, page 128, second column, first paragraph)

adjusting parallel operators of each parallel plan if necessary based on resources available for executing the query (generate parallel plan based on resources available, page 129, Section V, last paragraph; page 130, Section IV, last paragraph).